

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/511,132	ESSER, JOSEF	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Katherine W. Mitchell	3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Katherine W. Mitchell. (3) _____.
- (2) James Foley. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 December 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: no.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to request correction of a minor typing error in claim 11, stating the claim as written is allowable, but that "central bore hole and two surfaces, a concave side and a convex side," was intended to be --central bore hole and two surfaces, one of said surfaces being a concave side and the other of said surfaces being a convex side,-- so that two surfaces in addition to a convex side and a concave side would not all be required (as is required as written now). Since applicant has clearly made every effort to advance prosecution, examiner agreed to search the claim as proposed, and offered to do an examiners amendment to change the wording.